

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed February 1, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application in view of the foregoing Amendments and the following Remarks. The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 2-6 and 16-20 have been canceled, and claims 1, 7-12, 15, 21-27 have been amended. Claims 1, 7-15, and 21-27 remain in this application, of which claims 1, 7, 12, 15, and 21 are independent claims. Claims 28-35 have been newly added as dependent claims.

### **Allowable Subject Matter in Claims 3-4, 7, 14, 17-18, 21, 26, and 27**

Claims 3-4, 7, 14, 17-18, 21, 26, and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claims 3-4 have been canceled.

Claim 7 has thus been amended to include all of the limitations of base claim 1, and thus is now allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 7, and thus is now believed to be allowable since the Examiner indicates allowable subject matter in claim 7.

Claim 14, which depends from and further limits claim 12, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable as stated above.

Claims 17-18 have been canceled.

Claim 21 has thus been amended to include all of the limitations of base claim 21, and thus is now allowable.

Claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 7. Claim 26, which depends from and further limits claim 7, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable as stated above.

Claim 27 has been amended to depend from claim 21. Claim 27, which depends from and further limits claim 21, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable as stated above.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,746,252 to Scott (hereafter referred to as "Scott").

Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled.

Claims 8, 10, and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 7. Claims 8, 10, and 11 which depend from and further limit claim 7, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable as stated above.

Claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitation of claim 7 which the Examiner indicates as being allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 12 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable as stated above.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12. Claim 13, which depends from and further limits claim 12, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable as stated above.

Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled.

Claims 22, 24, and 25 depend from claim 21. Claims 22, 24, and 25 which depend from and further limit claim 21, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable as stated above.

### **Claims 1 and 15**

The rejection of claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Scott is not appropriate because claims 1 and 15 have been amended to recite that substantially zero force is asserted on the pin of the IC device even when the whole of the pin of the IC device is completely inserted within the zif opening.

In contrast, referring to Fig. 2 of Scott, as the whole of the pin 22 is completely inserted into the receptacle 16, the spring 24 in the compression mount receptacle 16 pushes up against the pin 22. Thus, the receptacle 16 in Scott is not equivalent to a zif opening that asserts substantially zero force as the whole of the pin 22 is completely inserted therein.

Anticipation of a claimed invention requires the presence in a single prior art document of *each and every* element of the properly construed claim. The Federal Circuit has set out the following requirements for anticipation pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102:

...that a patent claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 “must demonstrate, among other things, identity of invention.”...[O]ne who seeks such a finding must show that each element of the claim in issue is found, either expressly or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, or that the claimed invention was previously known or embodied in a single prior art device or practice.

Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc., 976 F.2d 1559, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Because Scott does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 15, the rejection of claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Scott should be withdrawn.

### **Rejection of Claims 9 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 9 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,280,202 to Alden, 3<sup>rd</sup> et al.

Claim 9, which depends from and further limits claim 7, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable as stated above.

Claim 23, which depends from and further limits claim 21, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable as stated above.

#### **Newly Added Claims**

Claims 28 and 29 are newly added and depend from claim 26. Claims 28 and 29 which depend from and further limit claim 26, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 26 is allowable as stated above.

Claims 30 and 31 are newly added and depend from claim 7. Claims 30 and 31 which depend from and further limit claim 7, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable as stated above.

Claims 32 and 33 are newly added and depend from claim 27. Claims 32 and 33 which depend from and further limit claim 27, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 27 is allowable as stated above.

Claims 34 and 35 are newly added and depend from claim 21. Claims 34 and 35 which depend from and further limit claim 21, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable as stated above.

### Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
for the Applicant(s)

Dated: April 18, 2005

By:



Monica H. Choi  
Reg. No. 41,671  
Law Office of Monica H. Choi  
P.O. Box 3424  
Dublin, OH 43016-0204  
(614) 789-0240  
(614) 789-0241 (Fax)